

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| - • • | | | | (ν) | |
|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|---|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION VO. | |
| 10/061,861 | 02/01/2002 | R. Brad Campbell | PM 2000.097 | 238/1/ | |
| 7 | 0 11/18/2003 | | EXAM | INER | |
| ExxonMobil | Upstream Research C | LEE, JONG SUK | | | |
| P.O. Box 2189 | | | | | _ |
| Houston, TX 77252-2189 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| · | | • | 3673 | - 1 . | |

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | A | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | • | | / | | | |
| · Office Action Summary | | | 10/061,861 | CAMPBELL E | ET AL. | | | |
| | | | xaminer | Art Unit | $A\lambda$ | | | |
| | | | ong-Suk (James) Lee | 3673 | | | | |
| Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspond nc address Period for Reply | | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | | | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ | Responsive to communication(s) filed | d on <u>16 Sept</u> | tember 2003. | | | | | |
| 2a)⊠ | This action is FINAL . 2b | o) This ac | tion is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3)□ | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | | |
| 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ | 4) Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3,7-20 and 24-47 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 4-6 and 21-23 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | |
| | ion Papers | ion and/or e | iection requirement. | | | | | |
| 9) | The specification is objected to by the | Examiner. | | | | | | |
| | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: | | ted or b) objected to | by the Examiner. | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | |
| | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including | the correction | is required if the drawing | (s) is objected to. See 3 | 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) | | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) | | | | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | | | |

Art Unit: 3673

1

DETAILED ACTION

3

- 1. The amendment filed September 16, 2003 has been entered.
- 2. Upon further consideration, allowable subject matter as recited in claims 35-42 indicated
- in the previous office action mailed on June 16, 2003 has been withdrawn in view of the admitted
- reference to Davies et al (US 5,758,990). Therefore, the new ground of rejection based on the
- 8 above-mentioned reference is as follows.

9

10

11

12

13

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

15 16

17

19

20

21

- 4. Claims 1-3, 7-10, 13, 14, 18-20, 24-27, 30, 31, 35-42 and 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davies et al (US 5,758,990).
- Davies et al discloses a riser tensioning device comprising of: at least one buoyancy element/buoyance can (16); a frame (24) comprising a plurality of vertical tubular members (14) externally disposed to the at least one buoyancy element (22) by enclosing the buoyancy member

Art Unit: 3673

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21 _____

and a plurality of connectors (24) securing the vertical members to a riser stem pipe (12), the riser stem pipe secured to a riser (18), the one or more connectors (24) having a radial arms (A) (see Fig. 3) with a plate, the frame further comprising at least one horizontal bracing member (B) external to the buoyancy member (16); one or more gas service lines (36) positioned within the frame and enter the buoyancy can (16) (see Figs. 1-6; col.2, lines 23-67; col.3, lines 1-53; col.4, lines 1-4).

Although Davies et al is silent with respect to the frame's structural function of carrying loads exerted by external force, such as wave and/or current action in the water, it is believed to be inherent that Davies et al's frame protect the riser from external loads of wave or current action in the water while being in use.

Further, in the apparatus claim, patentable weight is not given to the merely functional limitation, such as "the frame is constructed to carry loads exerted by external forces" in claims 1, 18 and 46.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

Art Unit: 3673

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 3 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al in view of Johnson (US 4,477,207). The teachings of Bartholomew et al. have been discussed above.

However, Davies et al fails to disclose or fairly suggest the buoyancy element being syntectic foam. Johnson discloses a marine riser buoyancy assembly including a buoyancy element (10) being made of syntectic foam (see Figs. 1-2; col.3, lines 40-64).

Therefore, in view of Johnson, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the buoyancy can of Davies et al with the syntactic foam material in order to reduce the manufacturing cost without having associated parts for providing the air/gas supply to the buoyancy can of Davies et al.

7. Claims 11, 12, 28, 29 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al in view of Marshall (US 5,447,392). The teachings of Davies et al have been discussed above.

Art Unit: 3673

10

12

13

14

16

17

19

However, Davies et al fails to disclose or fairly suggest the frame being positively or neutrally buoyant in water. Marshall discloses a riser support system comprising of a riser (12A) passing through a tubular frame with a guided buoy (32) attached to the tubular frame as depicted in Fig. 2 (see col.3, lines 26-57).

Therefore, in view of Marshall, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the guided buoy to the tubular frame of Davies et al. in order to increase the angular flexure that a given tubular frame can accommodate.

8. Claims 15-17 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al in view of Hale et al (US 4,422,801). The teachings of Davies et al have been discussed above.

However, Davies et al fails to disclose or fairly suggest the gas service line entering at the bottom of the buoyancy can. Hale et al discloses a buoyancy system for the underwater riser comprising a buoyancy can (24), a gas/air service (13) line being connected to the bottom of the buoyancy can as depicted in Fig. 3 (see Figs. 1-5; col.4, lines 44-68; col.5, lines 1-65).

Therefore, in view of Hale et al, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to efficiently provide the compressed gas or air, which is lighter than the ambient pressure, to the buoyancy can by closing the top portion of the buoyancy can.

Art Unit: 3673

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

With respect to the radially arched shape of the bracing member, it would have been obvious to one of ordinally skill in the art at time the invention was made to make the frame structure in round/circular shape to decrease the impact to the frame from wave or current action.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 4-6 and 21-23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 3673

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jong-Suk (James) Lee whose telephone number is (703) 308-6777. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 6:30 AM to 3:00 PM Monday thru Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather C. Shackelford, can be reached on (703) 308-2978. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168.

J. Lee /jjl

November 15, 2003

19 20

21

22

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

Jong-Suk (James) Lee Primary Examiner Art Unit 3673

Attachment: Fig. 3 of Davies et al. (US 5,758,990)